

REMARKS

Applicant has received and reviewed the Final Office Action mailed by the Office on August 15, 2006 (hereinafter, "Final Action"), and submits this response to the Final Action with a request for continued examination (RCE).

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-9, 13-15, and 21-29 were pending in the present application. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 13, 21, 23, 25, 26, 28, and 29 to clarify claimed subject matter and/or correct informalities. The specification and drawings support these claim amendments at least at pages 7-13, Figures 1, and 2. Therefore, these revisions introduce no new matter.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-9, 13-15, and 21-29 remain pending upon entry of the present Amendment. Applicant requests favorable consideration of this response and allowance of the subject application based on the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-2, 4, 7-19, 13-15, and 21-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over a publication titled, "LASS: Putting the telephone customer in charge", by C. Brant Hirschman, Grant E. Swinehart, and Marie L. Todd, dated May 1985 (hereinafter, "Hirschman"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,436,957 to McConnell (hereinafter, "McConnell"), and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0085700 to Metcalf (hereinafter, "Metcalf"). Applicant respectfully traverses the stated rejections.

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant has amended **independent Claim 1**, to clarify further features of the subject matter. Independent Claim 1 now recites:

In a telecommunication system via an advanced intelligent network (AIN), a method for blocking future calls from a one or more callers to a callee, the method comprising:

controlling a service switching point (SSP) and communicating with a terminal associated with the one or more callers and the callee;

receiving a first instruction from the callee to access a service to block future calls from a telephone number associated with a first caller to the callee, wherein the callee dials a special sequence comprising a combination of numerals, letters, and symbols;

providing at least one callee selection via a voice prompt responsive to the first instruction;

receiving a second instruction from the callee prior to an expiration of a predetermined time period, wherein the time period may be determined based on parameters for blocking future calls;

receiving and identifying the telephone number to block associated with the first caller, wherein identifying the telephone number comprises at least one of a reverse caller-ID technology or a reverse white pages look-up technology;

storing the telephone number to block associated with the first caller in a caller block table in a service data point (SDP);

playing a voice announcement to the callee that blocking future calls from the telephone associated with the first caller has been activated;

preventing, via the service switching point (SSP), one or more phone calls from the telephone number associated with the first caller from being forwarded to a second telephone number associated with the callee;

playing a callee-selected message to the first caller of the telephone number to block when the first caller attempts to call the callee;

receiving a third instruction from the callee to access the service to block future calls from a telephone number associated with a second caller, wherein the callee dials the special sequence comprising the combination of numerals, letters, and symbols;

providing at least one callee selection via the voice prompt responsive to the third instruction;

receiving a fourth instruction from the callee prior to the expiration of the predetermined time period, wherein the time period may be determined based on parameters for blocking future calls;

receiving and identifying the telephone number to block associated with the second caller, wherein identifying the telephone number associated with the second caller is provided by the callee;

storing the telephone number to block associated with the second caller in the caller block table;

playing a voice announcement to the callee that blocking future calls from the telephone number associated with the second caller has been activated; and

preventing, via the service switching point (SSP), one or more phone calls from the telephone number associated with the second caller from being forwarded to a second telephone number associated with the callee.

Applicant submits that the evidence relied upon by the Office does not support the rejections made under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicant asserts that Hirschman, McConnell, and Metcalf fail to teach or suggest “an advanced intelligent network (AIN) method for blocking future calls from one or more callers to a callee, controlling a service switching point (SSP) and communicating with a terminal associated with the one or more callers and the callee; the callee dials a special sequence comprising a combination of numerals, letters, and symbols; identifying the telephone number comprises at least one of a reverse caller-ID technology or a reverse white pages look-up technology; providing at least one callee selection via a voice prompt responsive to the instruction; the time period may be determined based on parameters for blocking future calls; storing the telephone number to block associated with the first (second) caller in the caller block table; playing a voice announcement to the callee that blocking future calls from the telephone number associated with the first (second) caller has been activated; and preventing, via the service switching point (SSP), one or more phone calls from the telephone number associated with the caller

from being forwarded to a second telephone number associated with the callee” as recited in Claim 1.

The Cited References Fail to Teach or Suggest AIN, SDP, SSP, Special Sequence, Voice Prompt, Reverse Caller ID, Reverse White Pages, Caller Block Table

First, Applicant asserts the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Applicant agrees with the Office that Hirschman does not teach the use of AIN, service data point, and service switching point, in the telecommunication system to connect between a caller and a callee (Office Action, page 3). Therefore, the Office cited McConnell and Metcalf for this teaching missing from Hirschman.

McConnell and Metcalf fail to compensate for the deficiencies in Hirschman. McConnell is directed to establishing restrictions on what types of calls can be made or specify parameters for controlling the routing of calls (Abstract). McConnell provides that commercial subscribers may restrict communication services on a group of the subscriber's telephone lines (col. 4, lines 3-5), may control routing of calls (col. 9, lines 52-57), and may process calls from the subscriber's identified group of lines (col. 10, lines 23-25). Metcalf is directed to playing back messages that will dissuade the caller from calling again (Abstract). In Metcalf, the telephony service provider can also provide audio directions – such as a type that is used to automate call processing at places of business and the like - to guide the user through the configuring of his phone's messaging, such as group types, or genres, of messages ([0038]).

In contrast to the cited art, Applicant's Claim 1 recites in part, "via AIN, blocking future calls from one or more callers to a callee; controlling a service switching point (SSP) and communicating with a terminal, the callee dials a special sequence comprising a combination of numerals, letters, and symbols; identifying the telephone number comprises at least one of a reverse caller-ID technology or a reverse white pages look-up technology; storing the telephone number to block associated with the first caller in a caller block table in a service data point (SDP); time period may be determined based on parameters for blocking future calls; preventing, via the service switching point (SSP), one or more phone calls from the telephone number associated with the first caller from being forwarded to a second telephone number associated with the callee." Hirschman, McConnell, or Metcalf, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest these recited features.

The evidence cited in the Final Action is insufficient to support a prima facie case of obviousness of the features recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the references relied upon by the Office does not support the rejections made under §103(a).

The Proposed Modification of the Cited Art Renders the Primary Reference Unsatisfactory for its Intended Purpose

Second, the MPEP states, "if proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification" (MPEP §2143.01 V.) For example, using McConnell's system in Hirschman would render McConnell unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. In particular, the system of McConnell would be rendered

unsatisfactory in restricting communication services on a group of the subscriber's telephone lines, controlling routing of calls, and processing calls from the subscriber's identified group of lines, if modified by the teachings of Hirschman's system. Therefore, the modification presented would render McConnell inoperable. Thus, there can be no motivation to combine the references as proposed.

The Cited Art Provides No Suggestion or Motivation to Modify or Combine the References

Third, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings (MPEP §2142). The Office stated the motivation for combining the methods of Hirschman, McConnell, and Metcalf is "to block future calls from the caller to the callee using voice prompt and second instruction from the callee". However, there is nothing in either of the references that would suggest this motivation. There is no suggestion or motivation to combine the three references. The asserted motivation relies on hindsight without evidence of teaching or suggestion to propose the suggested combination. Therefore, this rejection is improper for this additional reason.

Independent Claims 13 and 21 are directed to telecommunications systems, and each is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

Dependent claims 2, 4, 7-9, 14-15, and 22-29 depend directly or indirectly from one of independent Claims 1, 13, and 21 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency.

These claims are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 1, are not taught, or suggested by Hirschman, McConnell, and Metcalf. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejections.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not render the claimed subject matter obvious and that the claimed subject matter, therefore, are allowable over the cited references. For all of these reasons, the §103(a) rejection of these claims is improper and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-9, 13-15, and 21-29 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the subject application. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
421 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201

Dated: Jan. 16, 2007

By: Shirley Lee Anderson
Shirley Lee Anderson
Reg. No. 57,763
(509) 324-9256 ext. 258